

REMARKSI. Miscellaneous

Applicant has amended the title of the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out that holes were punched through on top of page 3. The new page 3 should replace the page 3 with holes.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the typographical error in claim 23. The amended claim 23 has corrected the typographical error.

III. The 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7,10-11, 13, 15-16, 20, 22-24, 29 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Daswani et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,477,565 ("DASWANI"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Overview

DASWANI discloses an intermediary server system between a handheld device and the Internet. The intermediary server system extracts and restructures data into a specific format for display at the handheld device requesting such data.

The method and apparatus of the present invention provides a unique capability of restructuring data ... instead of simply converting one form of data into another, a first data set is analyzed and understood so that an alternate data set in a format specific to applications executable on a receiving device may be created that reflects the desired content and function of the first data set.

DASWANI, col. 8, lines 30-38.

Such restructured data are sent to the requesting handheld device to be displayed using existing applications on the device. DASWANI addresses handheld devices' limited capabilities by extracting and restructuring data into specific formats suitable for display on the handheld devices without augmenting their limited capabilities. Indeed, the advantage of the DASWANI invention is that handheld devices do NOT have to be modified (by software and/or hardware) to view the desired restructured data. DASWANI, col. 3, lines 5-9.

In contrast, the rejected claims do not require restructuring data. Rather, the rejected claims provide alternative ways to display desired information (e.g., a web page and/or internet services) without necessarily modifying such information. The alternative ways not only allow information to be displayed unaltered but also allow such information to be displayed on devices other than the requesting handheld device.

B. Claim 1

It is axiomatic that the cited reference in a §102 rejection must disclose every element in the rejected claim. Claim 1 recites a system for providing Internet-related services ..., comprising:

a client module embedded in the handheld device to enable the handheld device to send a selected stored Universal Resource Locator (URL) via a local communication link, wherein the URL indicates a desired Internet web page;

a receiver that receives the URL sent from the handheld device via the local communication link;

a web access module coupled to the receiver and to an external Internet via an Internet communication link different from said local communication link to access and retrieve the desired web page from a remote web server via the external Internet; and

a render system coupled to the web access module to render the retrieved web page to the user of the handheld device.

Based on the arguments presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that DASWANI does not disclose or suggest multiple elements of claim 1.

1. DASWANI Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Client Module

DASWANI discloses a handheld device that does not have a client module as recited by claim 1. In DASWANI, the handheld device is neither modified by software or hardware for receiving “Internet-based data.” DASWANI, col. 3, lines 5-9 and col. 5, lines 5-12. Such “Internet-based data” are extracted and restructured by an intermediate server system, physically separate from the handheld device, then distributed to the handheld device as “reformatted data” to be displayed by existing applications on the handheld device. DASWANI, col. 4, lines 48-55.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a client module embedded in the handheld device. Further, such embedded client module has access to a selected stored URL, which indicates a desired Internet web page. The client module enables a user of the handheld device to request a specific web page (and/or web services) rather than specific data within the web page (i.e., without requiring further modifications to be performed on the web page to extract and restructure data contained within the web page).

2. DASWANI Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Web Access Module

DASWANI also does not disclose or suggest the web access module as recited in claim 1. DASWANI discloses an intermediate server system that extracts and restructures data then transmits such restructured data to a requesting device. For example, if requested data are embedded in a web page, DASWANI discloses a system of extracting such data from the web page, restructuring that data, then sending them to the requesting device. DASWANI does not disclose or suggest ways to transmit the web page itself to allow access to the web page.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a web access module that retrieves “the desired web page” (i.e., indicated by the URL received from the client module) to be provided to the user.

3. DASWANI Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Render System

Lastly, DASWANI does not disclose or suggest the render system as recited by claim 1. DASWANI discloses displaying restructured data on a handheld device that is not modified by software or hardware. DASWANI, col. 5, lines 5-12. Thus, data have to be extracted and restructured by an intermediate server system to a specific format that may be displayed on such handheld device. *Id.*

In contrast, claim 1 recites a render system to render “the retrieved web page” (i.e., retrieved by the web access module based on the URL received from the client module) to the user of the handheld device. The render system does not have to be the handheld device nor be physically connected to the handheld device. Further, the render system allows the rendering of web pages (and/or Internet-related services) not just data contained in those web pages.

4. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, DASWANI fails to disclose or suggest multiple elements recited by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

C. Claims 2, 4-5, 7, 10-11

Claims 2, 4-5, 7 and 10-11 are dependent upon independent claim 1. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 1, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

D. Claim 13

Independent claim 13 does not recite the client module recited in claim 1. However, claim 13 recites a web access module and render module having substantially similar limitations as the web access module and render system of claim 1, respectively. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1 with regard to the web access module and the render system, Applicant respectfully submits that DASWANI does not anticipate claim 13 and claim 13 is also in condition for allowance.

E. Claims 15-16 & 20, 22-24

Claims 15-16 are dependent upon independent claim 13. Claims 20 and 22-24 are dependent upon independent claim 1. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 13, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

F. Claim 29

Independent claim 29 recites a client module having certain similar limitations as recited in claim 1. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1 with regard to the client module and the render system, Applicant respectfully submits that DASWANI does not anticipate claim 29 and claim 29 is also in condition for allowance.

G. Claim 32

Independent claim 32 does not recite the client module recited in claim 1. However, claim 32 recites a web access module and render module having substantially similar limitations as the web access module and render system of claim 1, respectively. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1 with regard to the web access module and the render system, Applicant respectfully submits that DASWANI does not anticipate claim 32 and claim 32 is also in condition for allowance.

H. Claims 33-34

Claims 33-34 are dependent upon independent claim 32. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 32, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

IV. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 3, 6, 8-9, 12, 14, 17-19, 21, 25-28, 30-31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over DASWANI. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Claims 3, 6, 8-9, 12, 14, 17-19, 21, 25-28, & 30-31

Claims 3, 6, 8-9, 12, 14, 17-19, 21, 25-28, & 30-31 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 13, 29 or 32. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 13, 29 and 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the 103 rejections are moot and the respective dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

B. Claim 35


Independent claim 35 does not recite the client module recited in claim 1. However, claim 35 recites a web access module and render system having substantially similar limitations as claim 1. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1 with regard to the web access module and the render system, Applicant respectfully submits that the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 35 is moot and claim 35 is also in condition for allowance.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

Law Office of Roxana H. Yang
P.O. Box 3986
Los Altos, CA 94024
(408)749-8098